A U M

In the highest antiquity, the people did not know that they had rulers. In the next age they loved and praised them. In the next, they feared them. In the next, they despised them.
—LAO TZE.

THEOSOPHY

Vol. XXX April, 1942 No. 6

LEARNING AND KNOWLEDGE

FAMILIARITY with the verbal forms in which the Theosophical teaching is expressed, and *knowledge* of the philosophy, as every student sooner or later realizes, are entirely different things. It is something of a shock to make this discovery, but it is also the beginning of wisdom.

Perception that words are not knowledge, and that even intellectual comprehension is useless by itself, may arise from any one of several causes. To some it comes as a sudden feeling of inadequacy in a difficult situation. The evening before, the student may have discoursed most learnedly about the after-death states and the cycle of reincarnation, and now he is confronted with the immediate need of one who has lost a loved one: What shall he say? Now he must draw on what he has felt and lived of the philosophy; apart from this, the *words* have but a hollow sound.

Another student may find himself unexpectedly in the society of several serious scientists. With growing humility, he listens to their earnest discussions and after a time comes to have a kind of respect for their agnosticism. Close contact has brought him understanding of the scientific frame of mind, and while still able to see its limitations, never again will he dispose of all "modern science" with an airy wave of the hand. Again, opportunity may come for him to speak of what he knows. What shall he say? Recite the "Fundamentals" as found beginning at page 12 of the first volume of *The Secret Doctrine?* No; he will not do that. He will seek some common ground of fact and idea, and, quite haltingly, perhaps, endeavor to suggest in his own words an approach to the question under discussion that may possibly provoke further interest and inquiry.

After a time of attempting to present Theosophy to others, the student realizes that every man of conviction, whatever his persuasion, has found enough truth in his beliefs to *work* for them, and only a real discovery of his own will cause him to adopt another basis. He is devoted to his present ideas because he is busy applying them, and he will not respect Theosophical ideas unless he can feel in the way they are presented the same practical conviction. He would, for example, be a courageous Theosophist who would undertake to discuss his philosophy with a Father Damien. So often the student realizes that some friend or acquaintance is in many ways a better theosophist than he is himself. The friend, from all appearances, is practicing what he knows with all his heart, while the student, so it seems to him, daily grows more painfully aware of his own shortcomings. He asks himself, "How is it that I, with this noble philosophy, accomplish so little, while my friend, who has no philosophy at all, is able to do so much?" This is one of the great mysteries of human nature, one that the student must work out for himself.

One practical assistance in the task of transforming Theosophical learning into knowledge is to have a clear purpose in mind while studying the teaching. The undercurrent of thought should always be, "How can I make this idea clear to someone else? Could I explain this by using a simple illustration?" The mind so trained runs naturally to applications; it sees Theosophy in every man's work and field of experience. To "talk Theosophy" no longer means employing a particular vocabulary, but the spread of a few leading ideas, no matter what their incidental garb.

It is important, also, to beware of Theosophical "shibboleths." There are forms of pat expression that students sometimes repeat until their meaning is virtually lost. If, in thinking about a problem, a set of words comes to mind mechanically, it is well to attempt another form of expression. Explanations which have crystallized into familiar word-formations need to be broken up and recast with fresh and larger meaning. The student whose habits of thought and forms of speech are not constantly being regenerated by further study is in danger of falling into a Theosophical rut. Yesterday's truth gets stale if today has not added to it. The Theosophist, less than any one else, can "rest on his laurels."

Another warning may be entered in connection with all metaphysical studies. Metaphysics provides systematic description of the nature of planes and principles above the physical, reaching upward, in progressive abstraction, to the primary Cause of manifested ex-

istence. The teaching of the seven principles is metaphysical; the various planes and states of consciousness are metaphysical conceptions. While within each man are the substantial realities to which these abstract ideas correspond, the student has no *knowledge* of such recondite aspects of the philosophy until he can literally control the principles under consideration. Knowledge is conscious power, nothing less.

The student should realize that he has only abstract and theoretical information about the principles until he begins to identify and control their operation, in some degree, within his own being. If, after reading the chapter on Manas in *The Ocean of Theosophy,* he has never caught his own mind performing the "natural motions" described by Mr. Judge, and from that time forth made a deliberate effort to direct his intellectual energy, then, to him, Chapter Seven is still a mere "dead letter." Mr. Judge's injunction, given elsewhere, to try to see a deep occult significance in every event, however trivial, is another way of saying that we need to practice on ourselves the philosophy we study in theory.

Theosophy has indeed an answer to every question, but it is not the Theosophy that is printed in books that gives us knowledge. The answers in the books are rather the keys to mysteries locked within ourselves, and for learning to become knowledge, the keys have to be turned.

Form of Self-consciousness

Our critics refuse to comprehend that a philosophical doctrine can teach that an atom imbued with divine light, or a portion of the great Spirit, in its latent stage of correlation, may, notwithstanding its reciprocal or corresponding similarity and relations to the one indivisible whole, be yet utterly deficient in self-consciousness. That it is only when this atom, magnetically drawn to its fellow-atoms, which had served in a previous state to form with it some lower complex object, is transformed at last, after endless cycles of evolution, into man—the apex of perfected being, intellectually and physically, on our planet—in conjunction with them it becomes, as a whole, a living soul, and reaches the state of intellectual self-consciousness.

A stone becomes a plant, a plant an animal, an animal a man, and man a Spirit, say the Kabalists. —H. P. Blavatsky.

THE THEOSOPHICAL SOCIETY: ITS MISSION AND ITS FUTURE

[AS EXPLAINED BY M. EMILE BURNOUF, THE FRENCH ORIENTALIST]

By H. P. BLAVATSKY

I

"It is another's fault if he be ungrateful; but it is mine if I do not give. To find one thankful man I will oblige many who are not."

—SENECA.

". . . . The veil is rent
Which blinded me! I am as all these men
Who cry upon their gods and are not heard,
Or are not heeded—yet there must be aid!
For them and me and all there must be help!
Perchance the gods have need of help themselves,
Being so feeble that when sad lips cry
They cannot save! I would not let one cry
Whom I could save! . . . . "

THE LIGHT OF ASIA.

IT has seldom been the good fortune of the Theosophical Society to meet with such courteous and even sympathetic treatment as it has received at the hands of M. Emile Burnouf, the well-known Sanskritist, in an article in the *Revue des Deux Mondes* (July 15, 1888)—*"Le Bouddhisme en Occident."*

Such an article proves that the Society has at last taken its rightful place in the thought-life of the XIXth century. It marks the dawn of a new era in its history, and, as such, deserves the most careful consideration of all those who are devoting their energies to its work. M. Burnouf's position in the world of Eastern scholarship entitles his opinions to respect; while his name, that of one of the first and most justly honoured of Sanskrit scholars (the late M. Eugène Burnouf), renders it more than probable that a man bearing such a name will make no hasty statements and draw no premature conclusions, but that his deductions will be founded on careful and accurate study.

His article is devoted to a triple subject: the origins of three religions or associations, whose fundamental doctrines M. Burnouf regards as identical, whose aim is the same, and which are derived

---

NOTE.—This *Lucifer* editorial by H. P. B. has been reprinted only once before in THEOSOPHY, in the first volume, now out of print, where it appears complete in the March, 1913, number (p. 195). It is now presented in two parts, the concluding portion to appear next month. Answering a criticism of the eminent orientalist, Burnouf, this article states categorically the conditions upon which the success of the Theosophical Movement depends. "The T. S., its Mission and its Future" was first published in *Lucifer* for August, 1888, a time when public interest in the European phase of the Movement was at its peak.—Editors, THEOSOPHY.

from a common source. These are Buddhism, Christianity, and—the Theosophical Society.

As he writes, page 341:

> This source, which is oriental, was hitherto contested; today it has been fully brought to light by scientific research, notably by the English scientists and the publication of original texts. Amongst these sagacious scrutinizers it is sufficient to name Sayce, Pool, Beal, Rhys-David, Spence Hardy, Bunsen. . . . It is a long time, indeed, since they were struck with resemblances, let us say, rather, identical elements, offered by the Christian religions, and that of Buddha. . . . During the last century these analogies were explained by a pretended Nestorian influence; but since then the Oriental chronology has been established, and it was shown that Buddha was anterior by several centuries to Nestorius, and even to Jesus Christ. . . . The problem remained an open one down to the recent day when the paths followed by Buddhism were recognized, and the stages traced on its way to finally reach Jerusalem. . . . And now we see born under our eyes a new association, created for the propagation in the world of the Buddhistic dogmas. It is of this triple subject that we shall treat.

It is on this, to a degree erroneous, conception of the aims and object of the Theosophical Society that M. Burnouf's article, and the remarks and opinions that ensue therefrom, are based. He strikes a false note from the beginning, and proceeds on this line. The T. S. was not created to propagate any dogma of any exoteric, ritualistic church, whether Buddhist, Brahmanical, or Christian. This idea is a widespread and general mistake; and that of the eminent Sanskritist is due to a self-evident source which misled him. M. Burnouf has read in the *Lotus,* the journal of the Theosophical Society of Paris, a polemical correspondence between one of the Editors of LUCIFER and the Abbé Roca. The latter persisting—very unwisely—in connecting theosophy with Papism and the Roman Catholic Church—which, of all the dogmatic religions, is the one his correspondent loathes the most—the philosophy and ethics of Gautama Buddha, not his later church, whether northern or southern, were therein prominently brought forward. The said Editor is undeniably a Buddhist—*i.e.,* a follower of the esoteric school of the great "Light of Asia," and so is the President of the Theosophical Society, Colonel H. S. Olcott. But this does not pin the theosophical body as a whole to ecclesiastical Buddhism. The Society was founded to become the Brotherhood of Humanity—a centre, philosophical and religious, common to all—not as a propaganda for Buddhism merely. Its first steps were directed toward the same great aim that M. Burnouf ascribes to Buddha Sakyamuni, who "opened his church to

all men, without distinction of origin, caste, nation, colour, or sex," (*Vide* Art. I. in the *Rules* of the T. S.), adding "My law is a law of Grace for all." In the same way the Theosophical Society is open to all, without distinction of "origin, caste, nation, colour, or sex," and what is more—of creed. . . .

The introductory paragraphs of this article show how truly the author has grasped, with this exception, within the compass of a few lines, the idea that all religions have a common basis and spring from a single root. After devoting a few pages to Buddhism, the religion and the association of men founded by the Prince of Kapilavastu; to Manicheism, miscalled a "heresy," and its relation to both Buddhism and Christianity, he winds up his article with—the Theosophical Society. He leads up to the latter by tracing (*a*) the life of Buddha, too well known to an English speaking public through Sir Edwin Arnold's magnificent poem to need recapitulation; (*b*) by showing in a few brief words that Nirvana is *not annihilation;*[1] and (*c*) that the Greeks, Romans and even the Brahmans regarded the *priest* as the intermediary between men and God, an idea which involves the conception of a *personal God,* distributing his favours according to his own good pleasure—a sovereign of the universe, in short.

The few lines about Nirvana must find place here before the last proposition is discussed. Says the author:

> It is not my task here to discuss the nature of Nirvâna. I will only say that the idea of annihilation is absolutely foreign to India, that the Buddha's object was to deliver humanity from the miseries of earth life and its successive reincarnations; that, finally, he passed his long existence in battling against Mâra and his angels, whom he himself called Death and the army of death. The word *Nirvâna* means, it is true, extinction, for instance, that of a lamp blown out; but it means also the absence of wind. I think, therefore, that Nirvâna is nothing else but that *requies æterna,* that *lux perpetua* which Christians also desire for their dead.

With regard to the conception of the priestly office the author shows it entirely absent from Buddhism. Buddha is no God, but a *man* who has reached the supreme degree of wisdom and virtue. "Therefore Buddhist metaphysics conceives the absolute Principle of all things which other religions call God, in a totally different manner and does not make of it a being separate from the universe."

The writer then points out that the equality of all men among themselves is one of the fundamental conceptions of Buddhism.

---

[1] The fact that Nirvana does *not* mean *annihilation* was repeatedly asserted in *Isis Unveiled,* where its author discussed its etymological meaning as given by Max Müller and others and showed that the "blowing out of a lamp" does not even imply the idea that Nirvana is the "extinction of consciousness." (See vol. i, p. 290 and vol. ii, pp. 117, 286, 320, 566, etc.)

He adds moreover and demonstrates that it was from Buddhism that the Jews derived their doctrine of a *Messiah.*

The Essenes, the Therapeuts and the Gnostics are identified as a result of this fusion of Indian and Semitic thought, and it is shown that, on comparing the lives of Jesus and Buddha, both biographies fall into two parts: the ideal legend and the real facts. Of these the legendary part is identical in both; as indeed must be the case from the theosophical standpoint, since both are based on the Initiatory cycle. Finally this "legendary" part is contrasted with the corresponding features in other religions, notably with the Vedic story of Visvakarman.[2] According to his view, it was only at the council of Nicea that Christianity broke officially with the ecclesiastical Buddhism, though he regards the Nicene Creed as simply the development of the formula: "the Buddha, the Law, the Church" (Buddha, Dharma, Sangha).

The Manicheans were originally *Samans* or Sramanas, Buddhist ascetics whose presence at Rome in the third century is recorded by St. Hyppolitus. M. Burnouf explains their dualism as referring to the double nature of man—good and evil—the evil principle being the *Mâra* of Buddhist legend. He shows that the Manicheans derived their doctrines more immediately from Buddhism than did Christianity and consequently a life and death struggle arose between the two, when the Christian Church became a body which claimed to be the sole and exclusive possessor of Truth. This idea is in direct contradiction to the most fundamental conceptions of Buddhism and therefore its professors could not but be bitterly opposed to the Manicheans. It was thus the Jewish spirit of exclusiveness which armed against the Manicheans the secular arm of the Christian states.

Having thus traced the evolution of Buddhist thought from India to Palestine and Europe, M. Burnouf points out that the Albigenses on the one hand, and the Pauline school (whose influence is traceable in Protestantism) on the other, are the two latest survivals of this influence. He then continues—

> Analysis shows us in contemporary society two essential elements: the idea of a *personal God* among believers and, among the philosophers, the almost complete disappearance of charity. The Jewish element has regained the upper hand, and the Buddhistic element in Christianity has been obscured.

---

[2] This identity between the *Logoi* of various religions and in particular the identity between the legends of Buddha and Jesus Christ, was again proven years ago in "Isis Unveiled," and the legend of Visvakarman more recently in the *Lotus* and other Theosophical publications. The whole story is analyzed at length in the "Secret Doctrine," in some chapters which were written more than two years ago.

> Thus one of the most interesting, if not the most unexpected, phenomena of our day is the attempt which is now being made to revive and create in the world a new society, resting on the same foundations as Buddhism. Although only in its beginnings, its growth is so rapid that our readers will be glad to have their attention called to this subject. This society is still in some measure in the condition of a mission, and its spread is accomplished noiselessly and without violence. It has not even a definite name; its members grouping themselves under eastern names, placed as titles to their publications: *Isis, Lotus, Sphinx,* LUCIFER. The name common to all which predominates among them for the moment is that of *Theosophical Society.*

After giving a very accurate account of the formation and history of the Society—even to the number of its working branches in India, namely, 135—he then continues:

> The society is very young, nevertheless it has already its history. . . . It has neither money nor patrons; it acts solely with its own eventual resources. It contains no worldly element. It flatters no private or public interest. It has set itself a moral ideal of great elevation, it combats vice and egoism. It tends toward the unification of religions, which it considers as identical in their philosophical origin; but it recognizes the supremacy of truth only. . . .
>
> With these principles, and in the time in which we live, the society could hardly impose on itself more trying conditions of existence. Still it has grown with astonishing rapidity. . . .

Having summarized the history of the development of the T. S. and the growth of its organization, the writer asks: "What is the spirit which animates it?" To this he replies by quoting the three objects of the Society, remarking in reference to the second and third of these (the study of literatures, religions and sciences of the Aryan nations and the investigation of latent psychic faculties, etc.), that, although these might seem to give the Society a sort of academic colouring, remote from the affairs of actual life, yet in reality this is not the case; and he quotes the following passage from the close of the Editorial in LUCIFER for November, 1887:

> He who does not practice altruism; he who is not prepared to share his last morsel with a weaker or a poorer than himself; he who neglects to help his brother man, of whatever race, nation, or creed, whenever and wherever he meets suffering, and who turns a deaf ear to the cry of human misery; he who hears an innocent person slandered, whether a brother Theosophist or not, and does not undertake his defense as he would undertake his own—is no Theosophist.—(LUCIFER No. 3.)
>
> This declaration [continues M. Burnouf] is not Christian because it takes no account of belief, because it does not proselytise

for any communion, and because, in fact, the Christians have usually made use of calumny against their adversaries, for example, the Manicheans, Protestants and Jews.[3] It is even less Mussulman or Brahminical. It is purely Buddhistic: the practical publications of the Society are either translations of Buddhist books, or original works inspired by the teaching of Buddha. Therefore the Society has a Buddhist character.

Against this it protests a little, fearing to take on an exclusive and sectarian character. It is mistaken: the true and original Buddhism is not a sect, it is hardly a religion. It is rather a moral and intellectual reform, which excludes no belief, but adopts none. This is what is done by the Theosophical Society.

We have given our reasons for protesting. We are pinned to no faith.

In stating that the T. S. is "Buddhist," M. Burnouf is quite right, however, from one point of view. It has a Buddhist colouring simply because that religion, or rather philosophy, approaches more nearly to the TRUTH (the secret wisdom) than does any other exoteric form of belief. Hence the close connection between the two. But on the other hand the T. S. is perfectly right in protesting against being mistaken for a merely Buddhist propaganda, for the reasons given by us at the beginning of the present article, and by our critic himself. For although in complete agreement with him as to the *true* nature and character of primitive Buddhism, yet the Buddhism of today is none the less a rather dogmatic religion, split into many and heterogeneous sects. We follow the Buddha alone. Therefore, once it becomes necessary to go behind the actually existing form, and who will deny this necessity in respect to Buddhism?—once this is done, is it not infinitely better to go back to the pure and unadulterated source of Buddhism itself, rather than halt at an intermediate stage? Such a half and half reform was tried when Protestantism broke awake from the elder Church, and are the results satisfactory?

Such then is the simple and very natural reason why the T. S. does not raise the standard of exoteric Buddhism and proclaim itself a follower of the *Church* of the Lord Buddha. It desires too sincerely to remain with that *unadulterated* "light" to allow itself to be absorbed by its distorted shadow. This is well understood by M. Burnouf, since he expresses as much in the following passage:

From the doctrinal point of creed, Buddhism has no mysteries; Buddha preached in parables; but a parable is a developed simile,

---

[3] And—the author forgets to add—"the Theosophists." No Society has ever been more ferociously calumniated and persecuted by the *odium theologicum* since the Christian Churches are reduced to use their tongues as their sole weapon—than the Theosophical Association and its Founders.—[ED.]

> and has nothing symbolical in it. The Theosophists have seen very clearly that, in religions, there have always been two teachings; the one very simple in appearance and full of images or fables which are put forward as realities; this is the public teaching, called exoteric. The other, esoteric or inner, reserved for the more educated and discreet adepts, the initiates of the second degree. There is, finally, a sort of science, which may formerly have been cultivated in the secrecy of the sanctuaries, a science called *hermetism,* which gives the final explanation of the symbols. When this science is applied to various religions, we see that their symbolisms, though in appearance different, yet rest upon the same stock of ideas, and are traceable to one single manner of interpreting nature.
>
> The characteristic feature of Buddhism is precisely the absence of this hermetism, the exiguity of its symbolism, and the fact that it presents to men, in their ordinary language, the truth without a veil. This it is which the Theosophical Society is repeating. . . . "

And no better model could the Society follow: but this is not all. It is true that no *mysteries* or esotericism exists in the two chief Buddhist Churches, the Southern and the Northern. Buddhists may well be content with the dead letter of Siddârtha Buddha's teachings, as fortunately no higher or nobler ones in their effects upon the ethics of the masses exist, to this day. But herein lies the great mistake of all the Orientalists. There *is* an esoteric doctrine, a soul-ennobling philosophy, behind the outward body of ecclesiastical Buddhism. The latter, pure, chaste and immaculate as the virgin snow on the ice-capped crests of the Himalayan ranges, is, however, as cold and desolate as they with regard to the *post-mortem* condition of man. This secret system was taught to the *Arhats* alone, generally in the Saptaparna (Mahavansa's *Sattapani*) cave, known to Ta-hian as the *Chetu* cave near the Mount Baibhâr (in Pali Webhâra), in Rajagriha, the ancient capital of Maghada, by the Lord Buddha himself, between the hours of *Dhyana* (or mystic contemplation). It is from this cave—called in the days of Sakyamuni, Saraswati or "Bamboo-cave"—that the Arhats initiated into the Secret Wisdom carried away their learning and knowledge beyond the Himalayan range, wherein the Secret Doctrine is taught to this day. Had not the South Indian invaders of Ceylon "heaped into piles as high as the top of the cocoanut trees" the *ollas* of the Buddhists, and burnt them, as the Christian conquerors burnt all the secret records of the Gnostics and the Initiates, Orientalists would have the proof of it, and there would have been no need of asserting now this well-known fact.

(To be concluded.)

A PRACTICAL IDEAL

LIFE, like a tree, is rooted in absolute unity, yet forever branches out in infinite divisibility. Thus the universe, as the sum total of conscious beings, is a vast assemblage of units forming a united Whole, every being a "unit" contained within a larger "whole," and at the same time in itself a lesser "whole" composed of lesser "units," in endless and unbroken continuity. Every unit represents a center of consciousness on an infinite ladder of being, an instrument of perception and action used by higher beings above, a user of beings below as its instruments. "The higher looks through the eyes of the lower," but each "lower" is at the same time a "higher" looking through the eyes of still "lower" ones. From atom to galaxy, from chromosome to man, every thing, every being, every "unit" is in reality a "unity," *i.e.,* a combination of units held together by a common idea and purpose, each unit with a particular function or duty of its own, but only as part of a larger duty to a larger whole. Thus each being as a "whole" is independent, but as a unit utterly interdependent.

The value of a unit does not lie in what it is able to do as independent unit, but in the degree to which it acts on the basis of responsibility toward the whole of which it is a part, and towards the lesser units of which it is the guiding intelligence. To assume a certain responsibility in any relation whatsoever means to assume the performance of a definite duty in the interest of the whole, and in utter dependableness. Greatness does not lie in the relative importance of a task, but in the faithfulness with which it is performed. The perfect working of the whole depends upon the perfect carrying out, on the part of each unit, of its own particular task. The greatest efforts of a unit to benefit the whole, if spasmodic, irregular, undependable, are infinitely less valuable to the whole than even the smallest but continuous, regular, sustained, dependable effort.

Suppose a stone in a wall suddenly dropped out of its place or became soft and unable to sustain its share of weight, could there be a wall? Yet no matter how small the stone, how insignificant its place and effort, as long as it stays in its place and does its work, its contribution to the whole will be invaluable—that simple small stone will actually make possible the existence of the whole wall. A clock, a typewriter, an automobile, a garment, any of the countless objects we use day by day, is useful only to the extent that every single part is absolutely faithful in the performance of its duty.

One little wheel, or screw, or bolt, or stitch failing to live up to its responsibility immediately causes trouble to the whole.

The human body is a highly complex and highly organized system of units within units, capable of rendering the "man" occupying it every conceivable service, from the most commonplace functions to the exercise of transcendent powers that can literally move the world. It can make of its user a god, or plunge him, a slave, into the depths of hell, all depending on how well each organ, each cell, each atom performs its duty in the interest of the whole.

The existence, the growth, the welfare of any thing, or being, or undertaking, of communities, races, or of mankind as a whole, depend utterly upon the regularity, the continuity, the dependableness of the contributions of its units, not upon their relative size. Thus it is possible for the smallest, the humblest, the least in the eyes of men, to render as great, nay, greater service than the "greatest." To realize this, in all relations with Life and lives everywhere—and every "thing" and every "body" *is* LIFE—is to foster the truest Social Ideal, the Great Ideal of Human Progression and Perfection.

TRUE BUDDHISM

Buddhism, cannot be justly judged in our age either by one or the other of its exoteric popular forms. Real Buddhism can be appreciated only by blending the philosophy of the Southern Church and the metaphysics of the Northern Schools. If one seems too iconoclastic and stern, and the other too metaphysical and transcendental, events being overcharged with the weeds of Indian exotericism—many of the gods of its Pantheon having been transplanted under new names into Thibetan soil—it is due to the popular expression of Buddhism in both churches. Correspondentially, they stand in their relation to each other as Protestantism to Roman Catholicism. Both err by an excess of zeal and erroneous interpretations, though neither the Southern nor the Northern Buddhist clergy have ever departed from Truth consciously, still less have they acted under the dictates of *priestocracy,* ambition, or an eye to personal gain and power, as the later churches have. —H. P. BLAVATSKY.

MAN—A SPIRITUAL BEING

WE are well acquainted with the attributes of man as a physical being. In fact, the modern science of anthropology is concerned with little else. Man's psychic attributes, too, are gradually being catalogued by students of applied psychology, and while the categories of psychic action presently in use are not easily re-interpreted in the terms of Theosophical philosophy, still, it can be done by reducing the concepts of modern psychology to the functions they represent and then examining the latter in the light of the teaching of the seven principles. In this connection, it may be noted that *clinical* psychology—the psychology, that is, which undertakes to deal with human conduct as such, as distinguished from the academic schools which anatomize the *psyche* and consider separately each limited function—has found it necessary to evolve a theory of human "principles," or different "levels" of action, in order to give an intelligible account of man's mental and emotional experiences. The Freudian speaks of the "id," the "ego," and the "super-ego," assigning to these categories various functions of motivation in psychologic life. And so with other schools of psychoanalysis.

The idea of man as a *spiritual* being, however, remains without definition in modern thought, unless the *skandhas* of Christianity, from which the present-day usage of "spiritual" derives its meaning, are credited as being a part of modern thought! The spiritual is commonly the nebulously good, the elevating, the artistic, and even that which arouses the more delicate emotions. "Spiritual" is frequently used by writers who have no idea that such a thing as "spirit" exists, so that from the viewpoint of semantic analysis, the adjective is literally without meaning.

A prime purpose of the Theosophical Movement is to bring discipline and substantial significance to the ethical vocabulary of the modern world. There are some words which are perverted beyond reclamation, or which from the beginning have represented debased ideas. These would be best dropped from the language. The whole series of theological terms, such as "grace," "sin," "salvation," "carnal," and many others, have too long been used in the warped contexts of Christian exegesis for them to be of any value for philosophy, except in an occasional analogy or historical allusion. The greatest offender of all is the word "God," which is seldom popular with the writer of sound intuitions, and actually repugnant to

those who have studied the moral ideas and social conditions that are always associated with the personal God idea. Again and again, theosophists find it necessary to dissociate the meaning of "spiritual" from any reference to God, for the latter inevitably calls up a host of related ideas that are the very opposite of spiritual conceptions.

While recognizing the importance of such criticism, it should be realized that the purification and disciplining of modern thought cannot be accomplished by criticism alone. It is necessary that there be affirmative conceptions consistent with the objections that have been offered to past ideas—conceptions which inspire the moral nature and stimulate the higher intellectual capacities of man. To fill this need, the Theosophical philosophy is present in the world.

What, then, is the meaning of "spiritual being"? According to the *Theosophical Glossary:*

> The term "Spirit" is applied solely to that which belongs directly to Universal Consciousness, and which is its homogeneous and unadulterated emanation. . . . Spirit is formless and immaterial, being, when individualized, of the highest spiritual substance. . . . Spirit, in short, is no *entity* in the sense of having form; for, as Buddhist philosophy has it, *where there is a form, there is a cause for pain and suffering.* But each individual spirit—this individuality lasting only throughout the manvantaric life-cycle—may be described as a center of consciousness, a self-sentient and self-conscious center; a state, not a conditioned individual.

Thus Spirit, defined in terms of itself, or its primary attribute, is *consciousness,* and an individualized "spirit" is a self-conscious center. But it is needful to consider the idea of Spirit in contrast with its logical opposite, Matter, and for this a *Secret Doctrine* passage may be quoted:

> There can be no manifestation of Consciousness, semi-consciousness, or even "unconscious purposiveness," except through the vehicle of matter; that is to say, on this our plane, wherein human consciousness *in its normal state* cannot soar beyond what is known as transcendental metaphysics, it is only through some molecular aggregation or fabric that Spirit wells up in a stream of individual or sub-conscious subjectivity. And as Matter existing apart from perception is a mere abstraction, both of these aspects of the ABSOLUTE—Cosmic Substance and Cosmic Ideation—are mutually inter-dependent. In strict accuracy—to avoid confusion and misconception—the term "Matter" ought to be applied to the aggregate of objects of possible perception, and "Substance" to *noumena;* for inasmuch as the phenomena of *our* plane are the creation of the perceiving Ego —the modifications of its own subjectivity—all the "states of matter

representing the aggregate of perceived objects" can have but a relative and purely phenomenal existence for the children of our plane (I, 328-9).

Using these definitions, it becomes clear that Spirit is that realm of which man grows into knowledge through inward realization—by enlarging the radius of his supersensuous consciousness; while matter relates to all forms of external perception. The spiritual aspect of a being unites it with all other beings: the more universal the sense of self, the more *spiritual* is the being. Matter, from this point of view, is simply limitation of spiritual perception. What is not realized as Self, or Spirit, must be perceived as not-Self, or Matter.

Cycles prevail only in the world of forms, for that which is formless can have neither beginning nor end. The indivisible Spirit, *Kutastha,* "he who standeth on high unaffected," referred to in the *Bhagavad-Gita, is* unaffected because it has no organs, physical or psychic, to be modified by experience—with which to "suffer and enjoy." This is the "spiritual nature of man," which "is never affected or operated upon by karma." Simply because the spirit in man does remain unmoved and unchanged by any and all experience, it is truly the knower and the seer.

Ishwara is a spirit, untouched by troubles, works, fruits of works, or desires.

In *Ishwara* becomes infinite that omniscience which in man exists but as a germ.

"Ishwara" does not evolve; but by Ishwara are realized all the fruits of spiritual evolution. "The important thing," Mr. Judge has written, "is to develop the Self in the self, and then the possessions of wisdom belonging to all wise men at once belong to us." *Spiritual* knowledge is not an acquisition; it belongs to us all the time, but our consciousness while in a body is so intent upon matter and its ever changing forms and correlations that this knowledge seldom has opportunity to become manifest.

To overcome the illusions produced by matter, to "kill out desire," to have a "conscious existence in spirit," to "renounce the fruits of action"—all these injunctions of the Teachers are simply the charge to act as spiritual beings. Spiritual sight sees everywhere the basis for unity that underlies the differentiations of separateness. It is the method of synthesis, as opposed to analysis. Both synthesis and analysis recognize the fact of differences, but only the former method takes account of the larger truth of unity in diversity. In this we have an explanation of H. P. B.'s constant use of analogy and her counsel to Theosophical students to employ analogy and correspondence in all their studies. Analogy is the means of identifying what

is common in different classes of experience. Analogy shows the uniformity of Nature's processes and demonstrates the absolute rule of law. Even the highest wisdom is won by applying the method of analogy: "He, O Arjuna, who *by the similitude found in himself* seeth but one essence in all things, whether they be evil or good, is considered to be the most excellent devotee."

Spiritual thought, then, is that form of inquiry which seeks to know reality as the Unity which supports all existence. Contrasted with this is Materialism, the very principle of which is separateness and denial of essential relation. Take, for example, the idea of a personal God. A more materialistic conception is not possible. This theological monstrosity is absolutely unique. His divine nature is separate from all lesser creatures, for by definition he alone is "God." Whereas the idea of Universal Spirit is a uniting conception, the personal God brings ultimate separation. Likewise, Law, in an anthromorphic system, cannot be regarded as an impersonal principle of universal order. There can be no really "natural" processes in a world where miracles are possible. Thus, in logical development from the idea of a personal God as the primary cause of all, every subsequent event must be a unique expression of God's will, and can never be understood as the expression of law in the scientific sense.

Because of the long association of the term "spiritual" with such conceptions, it will of necessity require many years of ceaseless correction and explanation on the part of theosophists to impress on the popular mind the philosophical meaning of this word. The method that was employed by Krishna in conveying the true idea is still the best, as illustrated in his reply to Arjuna's inquiry in the second discourse of the *Gita*. There he tells how one confirmed in spiritual knowledge *acts;* by this means Arjuna gains a realizing sense of his objective. The spiritual man, he learns, lives in the same calm state of mind and of feeling whether personal disaster or prosperity is his lot. He has risen above the cyclic oscillations of individual fortune, knowing that outward circumstances have no power to shape the real course of his life. Krishna continues, speaking of all the familiar causes of inward disturbance. None of these, he says, has power over the sage.

Indeed, from beginning to end, the *Gita* is devoted to showing the effects in a man's life of his having adopted the position of the Perceiver, the *spiritual* attitude of mind. And the greatness of this Scripture lies in the perfect balance between the universal and the particular. It is a symmetrical unfoldment of the manner in which a wise man meets and deals with the problems and obstacles of

moral evolution. No essential choice is omitted from consideration, and the gamut of decision is gone over at various levels of inward perception. In each case, however, the right course is ultimately defined as an attitude of mind; never is the formal act itself approved, but the spirit in which it is undertaken. As Krishna says at the close: "Thus have I made known unto thee this knowledge which is a mystery more secret than secrecy itself; ponder it fully in thy mind; act as seemeth best unto *thee*."

Law of Levitation

The levitation phenomenon has nought to do with the idyllic freaks of the electricity known to orthodox science, but everything with the mystery of the interchange of correlative forces. We published the key to it four years ago, in *Isis Unveiled* (Vol. I, pp. xxiii, xxiv. Art. Æthrobacy). Let any man's body be charged (whether consciously or otherwise) with the polarity of the spot which supports him (be it a natural soil, or a floor of whatever description) and the similar polarity will shoot his body off in the air like a child's balloon. It is no reason because the possibility of such a polaric assimilation has not yet come under the observation of the Royal Society, why some descendants of those whose forefathers have experimented for numberless ages upon the hidden powers of the human body—should not have cognizance of it. Naturally—the power manifests itself, but in extremely rare cases—in some nervous diseases of that kind which baffle science in all its phases; to produce it artificially, the person who guides it must be partially, if not wholly, acquainted with that which, in the Sanskrit works on Occultism, is called the "Nava Niddhi" or the *nine jewels* of Raja Yoga. The most perfect "Samadhi," the highest of the "Siddhis" of "Hatha-Yoga" can at best guide the subject to the threshold of the world of *invisible* matter, not to those of the world of spirit, where the hidden and subtler potencies of nature lie dormant until disturbed.

—H. P. Blavatsky.

THEOSOPHY AND PSYCHIC RESEARCH
II

THE psychic research of the twentieth century has two clearly marked divisions. One is frankly a continuation of the spiritualistic approach, involving mediums and séances. Not many scientists of standing have permitted their interest to roam in this unattractive field, only such independent thinkers as William James and one or two others having had the professional curiosity to examine, and the moral courage to admit, the phenomena, confessing as well as their inability to explain them. It may be well to place on record the important observations of Dr. James on this subject, as a salutary example of scientific integrity to his less conscientious successors. Writing on the "Final Impressions of a Psychic Researcher," he said:

> For twenty-five years I have been in touch with the literature of psychical research, and have had acquaintance with numerous "researchers." I have also spent a good many hours (though far fewer than I ought to have spent) in witnessing (or trying to witness) phenomena. Yet I am theoretically no "further" than I was at the beginning; and I confess that at times I have been tempted to believe that the Creator has eternally intended this department of nature to remain *baffling,* to prompt our curiosities and hopes and suspicions all in equal measure, so that, although ghosts and clairvoyances, and raps and messages from spirits, are always seeming to exist and can never be fully explained away, they also can never be susceptible of full corroboration.[1]

Briefly reviewing the manifestations of "physical phenomena" witnessed by the researchers of that period, Dr. James noted that despite extensive fraud by mediums, the "balance of testimony seems slowly inclining towards admitting the supernaturalist view" ("supernaturalist" here meaning simply non-materialistic). He adds the telling observation that when "a theory gets propounded over and over again, coming up afresh after each time orthodox criticism has buried it, and each time seeming solider and harder to abolish, you may be sure that there is truth in it." Thus:

> How often has "Science" killed off all spook philosophy, and laid ghosts and raps and "telepathy" away underground as so much popular delusion. Yet never before were these things offered to us so voluminously, and never in such authentic-seeming shape or with such good credentials. The tide seems steadily to be rising, in spite of all the expedients of scientific orthodoxy. It is hard not to suspect that here may be something different from a mere chap-

[1] In *Memories and Studies,* New York, 1917, p. 174 *et seq.*

> ter in human gullibility. It may be a genuine realm of natural phenomena.

Dr. James make it plain that he believes there *are* psychic phenomena inexplicable by ordinary knowledge or theories. "There is," he says, "*a residuum of knowledge displayed* that can only be called supernormal: the medium taps some source of information not open to ordinary people." He prefaces an account of his own convictions on this subject with a disclaimer:

> . . . Nor do I seek at all in this article to convert anyone to my belief that psychical research is an important branch of science. To do that, I should have to quote evidence; and those for whom the volumes of the S. P. R. "Proceedings" already published count for nothing would remain in their dogmatic slumber, though one rose from the dead. No, not to convert readers, but simply to *put my own state of mind upon record publicly is the purpose of my present writing.*

Having asserted his belief in the *commonness* of psychic phenomena, he adds:

> I wish to go on record for . . . *the presence,* in the midst of all the humbug, *of really supernormal knowledge.* By this I mean knowledge that cannot be traced to the ordinary sources of information—the senses, namely, of the automatist. In really strong mediums this knowledge seems to be abundant, though it is usually spotty, capricious and unconnected. Really strong mediums are rarities; but when one starts with them and works downwards into less brilliant regions of the automatic life, one tends to interpret many slight but odd coincidences with truth as possibly rudimentary forms of this kind of knowledge. . . .
>
> When was not the science of the future stirred to its conquering activities by the little rebellious exceptions to the science of the present? Hardly, as yet, has the surface of the facts called "psychic" begun to be scratched for scientific purposes. It is through following these facts, I am persuaded, that the greatest scientific conquests of the coming generation will be achieved.

Dr. James wrote this prophecy in 1909, thoroughly aware that his contemporaries would never be brought to admit the reality of psychic happenings. The phenomena, he realized, "are as massive and widespread as anything in Nature," but the study of them he called "tedious, repellent and undignified." So far as his own investigations were concerned, he simply followed the methods established by the London S. P. R., and had to confess, at the end of twenty-five years, that he was no closer to an explanation of them then than when he had begun. In this he simply verified the prediction of Madame Blavatsky, made in 1886, that "the men of science

cannot help the world to understand the *rationale* of phenomena, which for a little while longer in this cycle it will be quite impossible for them to account for, even to themselves." Theosophists may be grateful to Dr. James for his frank expressions on this subject, which are notable for their courage and candor.

The spiritualistic line of investigation, for these and other reasons, has not as yet been able to win much attention from the scientific world of the twentieth century, although the future may see a popular return to this method in psychic research. At present scientific interest is concentrated on the ESP experiments, as an approach to psychic phenomena more susceptible to the "controls" of scientific method. This latter line of investigation began with the work of the late William McDougall, an English psychologist who came to Harvard University in 1920, going to Duke in 1927, where he remained until his death in 1938. Dr. McDougall is appreciated by Theosophists as the only psychologist of note who maintained his defense of the concept of *soul* throughout the early decades of this century, during that period of ultra-materialism in psychological theory when Behaviorism became the popular educational gospel, and Freudianism the ethic of "sophisticated" persons. He wrote an able defense of dualism in psychology (his well known *Body and Mind*) and contributed some penetrating criticisms of psychoanalysis. Dr. McDougall, it may be observed, is known to have been interested in Theosophy.[2]

During 1923-5, when the *Scientific American* conducted its investigation of the materialization phenomena of "Margery," famous Boston medium ("Margery," who died Nov. 1, 1941, was Mrs. LeRoi Goddard Crandon, wife of an eminent surgeon), Dr. McDougall served on Dr. Harlow Shapley's committee of scientists who sat with the medium. While two members of the committee admitted the reality of ectoplasmic and other manifestations, Dr.

---

[2] Charles B. Ingham, an old friend of Dr. McDougall's, was a member of the original T. S. in England, and had known H. P. B. (See *Lucifer* III, 172-4). Soon after Dr. McDougall went to Harvard, Mr. Ingham, who was then visiting in Boston, gave the eminent psychologist copies of *The Key to Theosophy, The Theosophical Glossary* and *The Bhagavad-Gita,* as well as several copies of this Magazine. This was in 1920. Mr. Ingham had become acquainted with the work of U. L. T. during a short stay in Los Angeles about two years before and in ordering the above books for Dr. McDougall he wrote that the latter had expressed intense interest in Theosophical ideas. As evidence that this was true, and not merely "courtesy" on McDougall's part, it may be noted that a year or so later he was in Los Angeles, and at that time visited the quarters of U. L. T., conversing with one of the older students and purchasing W. Q. Judge's *Ocean of Theosophy.* It would be impossible to measure the influence of Theosophy on the development of Dr. McDougall's thinking, but that there was such influence cannot be questioned.

McDougall was unable to come to any definite conclusion after some fifty sittings.[3] It may be that while personally impressed, he then realized that the "séance" method of investigation would not be recognized by scientists in general, and that a less "mysterious" approach was necessary. What he hoped for from the study of psychic phenomena is clearly indicated in his presidential address to the American Society for Psychical Research in 1923:

> Unless Psychical Research . . . can discover facts incompatible with materialism, materialism will continue to spread. No other power can stop it; revealed religion and metaphysical philosophy are equally helpless before the advancing tide. And if that tide continues to rise and to advance as it is doing now, all the signs point to the view that it will be a destroying tide, that it will sweep away all the hard-won gains of humanity, all the moral traditions built up by the efforts of countless generations for the increase of truth, justice and charity.[4]

Soon after he had become professor of psychology at Duke University, Dr. McDougall inaugurated a series of experiments in Telepathy, conducted under the direction of Dr. J. B. Rhine. This was the beginning (about 1930) of the now famous cycle of ESP research, which has brought a measure of academic fame—some would say notoriety—to Dr. Rhine, as well as jeers and cat-calls from the less intelligent materialists.

The spirit in which these researches were undertaken is suggested by the initial editorial of the *Journal of Parapsychology,* which began publication in March, 1937. While unsigned, this article bears every evidence of being from Dr. McDougall's pen. These are the questions he hoped that psychic research would help to answer:

> What are the relations of mind to matter? Are mental processes always and everywhere intimately and utterly dependent upon material or physical organizations? Do the volitions, the strivings, the desires, the joys and sorrows, the judgments and beliefs of men make any difference to the historical course of the events of our world, as the mass of men at all times have believed? Or does the truth lie with those few philosophers and scientists who, with or without some more or less plausible theory in support of their view, confidently reject well-nigh universal beliefs, telling us that the physical is co-extensive with the mental and that the powers and potentialities of mind may be defined by the laws of the physical sciences?

After reviewing the work of the past sixty years in psychic research, and noting the difficulties imposed by prejudice, the editorial continues:

---

[3] Conan Doyle, *History of Spiritualism* II, 219. [4] *Ibid.* II, 261-2.

> No wonder that sixty years of endeavor of this amateur kind, very admirable as it has been in many ways, has not succeeded in gathering evidences which would suffice to establish for men at large definite answers to the questions asked! These efforts have succeeded in effectively raising the question of the possibility of attaining, by the methods of science, answers to some of the great questions previously left to the metaphysicians; and they have made such inquiries respectable, which in itself was no small achievement. But it has become clear, nevertheless, that most admirable and indispensable as was the work of these societies, something more is required to carry further the advance they have so well begun, work of a more systematic, more sustained, more continuous and more broadly based kind; in short, organized professional effort the continuity of which should not be in immediate dependence on popular favor and interest and on the lives, health, and self-sacrificing labors of a few amateur enthusiasts.

The ESP program at Duke was intended to fulfill that requirement. It is a faithful application of the method described as "scientific" by H. P. B. in her *Theosophist* article in 1886 ("Occult or Exact Science?" THEOSOPHY VII), which, she asserted, psychic researchers must follow.

In his own article in the *Scientific Monthly,* Dr. Rhine reports the extent and character of ESP research since 1882:

> The direct experimental investigation of the occurrence of ESP has extended over a period of about sixty years, having begun with the formation of the Society of Psychical Research in England in 1882. Since that time there have been 145 reports of systematic investigations of this kind, totalling 4,918,196 trials. . . . Of the 145 reports, 61 were by psychologists, 39 by other academic men, 18 by non-academic professional men and 24 by laymen. The great majority of the reports written by psychologists have been written during the last six years.[5]

Dr. Rhine says that 73 per cent of these reports found positive evidence of extra-sensory perception, but because of the more exacting procedures recently established, he restricts the evidence presented in his article to that developed during the past six years. Most of the discussion is devoted to unexciting statistical summaries, but a few striking facts are included. Among the latter is one case involving 1,850 trials. (Each trial constitutes running through a deck of 25 ESP cards once, the subject being required to name the card without seeing it.) The investigator in this case was Dr. Bernard F. Reiss, of Hunter College, New York, who was separated from his subject by a city block. The cards were handled by the

[5] *Scientific Monthly,* November, 1940.

experimenter and the subject attempted to call them. Dr. Rhine gives the results:

> Under these conditions in a series of 1,850 trials, the subject averaged 18.24 hits per 25, in one instance scoring a perfect run of 25 hits. . . . The Reiss tests were not of the more common pure clairvoyance type but were based upon what is called the general extra-sensory perception or GESP condition (that is, the experimenter looked at each card as the percipient was attempting to call it, thus allowing for both telepathy and clairvoyance).

The results obtained by Reiss are of special interest because of his initial scepticism. Dr. Gardner Murphy, of Columbia University, relates how Dr. Reiss came to make his experiments:

> In 1935, Rhine was asked to lecture on his current investigations before a faculty and student group at Hunter College in New York. He gave a brief account of his methods and results. At the close of his report, a member of the faculty, Professor Bernard F. Reiss, remarked, in effect, "Either you didn't use the methods you described or you obtained results you didn't report." Rhine smiled and remarked, "In other words I'm a liar." Reiss replied, "I didn't say that." Rhine said, "The only way in which you will reach any conviction regarding my own work will be through your own independent repetition of such experiments..' Reiss took the challenge.[6]

Murphy, like Rhine, emphasizes the non-theoretical character of such experiments. They are simply trying to establish the *fact* of telepathy. This expression, extra sensory perception, Murphy says, "is a neutral term, involving no hypothesis." It is "purely operational." His article was written at the request of the editors of the *Scientific Monthly,* as a "reply" to Prof. Ely's attack on the ESP experimenters.

Returning to Dr. Rhine, it should be realized that while he argues only for the existence of the fact of superphysical perception of some sort, he is thoroughly aware of the implications of ESP for scientific knowledge generally. He frequently recurs to this phase of the question:

> The problem of determining whether ESP occurs is important at this stage in the history of psychology not because of the practical interest in the possibility of extending the range of human perception —important though that may be. It is important primarily because the scientific world has settled down to the assumption that this extra-sensory class of phenomena does not occur, that it is, on a priori grounds, impossible. The trend of scientific thought regarding the relation between mental processes and the physical world has, since the days of Aristotle, followed the lead attributed to that philoso-

[6] *Scientific Monthly,* September, 1941.

> pher himself: *"Nihil est in intellectu quin prius feurit in sensu."* [Nothing can be perceived by the intellect before being perceived by the senses.] To find, therefore, ever so slight an exception to this sensorial-physical conception would presumably have the same revolutionary consequences for modern psychology that the discovery of ever so small an exception to Aristotelian astronomy had for that science in the days of Galileo.

Recognition of ESP is important, Rhine maintains, because of its tremendous significance for both science and philosophy. The power seems to be common, more or less, to all men:

> Both normal and abnormal subjects have been successful, as well as both blind and seeing, highly intelligent and subnormal, young and old, male and female, hypnotizable and non-hypnotizable, hypothyroid and hyperthyroid.
>
> All this suggests that the ability is not a superficial acquisition, not an odd and isolated development, but something which is perhaps a deeply imbedded property of the personality in all its diversified forms.

If we retain our present meaning of the word "physical," Dr. Rhine concludes, it must be admitted that extra-sensory perception occurs in ways independent of all known modes of physical communication. It is certain that the phenomena belong to an order of events or processes sharply separated from the workings of "the sensory-mechanical world with which science has had its main dealings."

In its major aspects, at least, Dr. Rhine's work has little or nothing in common with the "dabbling" technique of the Spiritualists and parlor "occultists." Whatever his private suspicions—and he must have them—regarding the meaning of the phenomena, his published statements are meticulously in adherence to the canons of orthodox scientific method, and gradually, by dint of sheer volume of evidence and endless repetition, he and his colleagues will finally convince the scientific world of the reality of a supersensuous realm and of the rule of laws, however recondite, which govern it. Both the spirit and the method of his undertaking, as a quest for knowledge, are beyond criticism from the purely scientific point of view, and, looked at in the perspective of the Theosophical Movement, this work may be seen as an important phase in race-mind evolution. Although to Theosophists and many others, "proof" of telepathy is likely to appear ridiculously unnecessary, the materialists still deny its existence, and Dr. Rhine is slowly but surely proving them wrong.

Considering the fact of the sudden impetus in researches of this sort, starting some six years ago, it should be clear that they represent the beginnings of the twentieth century cycle of psychism, rather than a continuation of the nineteenth century movement. Rhine has, so to say, made a "fresh start," independent of the eddying currents which followed in the wake of the Theosophical Movement of 1875, and his work has evolved according to the pattern set by H. P. B. for inductive research. Further, Dr. Rhine's clear appreciation of the philosophical possibilities which must open when ESP is admitted, and his frequent reference to those possibilities, suggest that the "cycle" destined to "change and transform entirely" the views of scientists may now have entered its genetic stage. The sober conclusion of his article in the *Scientific Monthly* should find Theosophists sympathetic to his general purposes, and it may help to open the minds of a few, at least, of the general scientific reading public. If, from having admitted the reality of ESP, he says, scientific thought is led to part with the old materialistic conception of the world, however cautiously—

> the scientific reconstruction that must follow is probably far beyond present-day capacity to realize. But by this very eccentricity of the consequences of the ESP hypothesis may be measured roughly the shift of the center of scientific perspective of the universe which logically must follow in the fullness of time and with continued research. What has been found thus far is something to be explained, and later incorporated, in a much enlarged world of knowledge, more than it is a step of enlightenment itself. The investigation has been opened instead of closed.

"Note" From the Theosophist

We do not quite agree with our brother's views on the subject of predestination, unless he means thereby that course of effects, the causes of which were already produced by the individual during his previous "incarnation." We hold that the science of Astrology only determines the *nature of effects,* by a knowledge of the law of magnetic affinities and attractions of the Planetary bodies, but that it is the *Karma* of the individual himself, which places him in that particular magnetic relation. However, the claims of the *Science* of Astrology are ably put forward by our brother, and it would be interesting to have good contributions on the science itself.—*Editor.*

—*Theosophist,* February, 1885.

THE CENTENARY CYCLE

QUESTION: A definite statement is made by Madame Blavatsky concerning the appearance of another "Messenger" in the latter part of this century and the presentation of another instalment of Theosophical teaching. It has always been puzzling to this student that so definitive an assertion should be made publicly, even though it may very possibly have been a matter of certain knowledge to H. P. B. and to those who selected it for repetition—W. Q. Judge and Robert Crosbie. Of what value to the Theosophical student can this idea be, since it seems that such statements must be taken on faith or as revelation? Further, to the inquirer who distrusts the prediction of Christianity regarding the return of Christ, an obstacle is presented. If he reads in the *Key, The Secret Doctrine* or in *The Friendly Philosopher* that the coming of another Great Teacher is pre-ordained, his reasoning faculty may utter immediate warning against such an idea, on the ground of its close resemblance to the teachings of various Christian sects that have prophesied the coming of another Messiah. The question is not whether the statement is true or not, since this student has from experience learned that Madame Blavatsky's statements are more than merely "likely" to be reliable, but it is felt that the Theosophist should strive to see *why* H. P. B. made the statement publicly, especially when she must have known it might bring contemptuous smiles and cries of "revelation" from some inquirers.

Answer: Considering simply the facts of Theosophical history, two different though complementary answers can be made. First, it is obvious that the definite statement regarding the coming of the next Messenger carries with it a specific application of the fundamental Theosophical tenet of cycles. It emphasizes to the student who is laboring against great odds that in this cycle a natural transition to larger opportunities is proceeding. It indicates that his duty is to continue his work of preparing the race mind, so that the most can be made of such larger opportunities when they do come. The statement is a focusing point for this type of consideration, without which the labors of the Theosophist would seem almost futile from a social standpoint. It has served many as a source of encouragement. While as "prophecy," it must be taken as a matter of "faith" to some degree, we should remember that *any* encouragement is a matter of faith, and that in this case the faith upon which the encouragement is founded need not be blind—backed as it is by

the demonstrably correct statements of the law of cycles made by the same teachers.

The second answer involves so practical a consideration that in itself it seems sufficient reason for the prophecy regarding 1975. History shows with what avidity various self-styled Theosophical prophets have arisen as "successors" to H. P. B., claiming to be bearers of an additional and more revealing "message." The simple fact of H. P. B.'s clear statement has been enough to prevent any conscientious student from falling victim to such pretensions. This, very likely, was H. P. B.'s intent in saying what she did. No claimant of occult honors could disregard H. P. B. nor imply that he was in a position to "add" to the truths she synthesized under the name of Theosophy. As Robert Crosbie has put it, "There is no question anywhere as to who brought Theosophy to the Western world." She, who introduced Theosophy, who gave its Movement birth, was the undisputed Theosophical "authority," though never did she herself make such claim nor wish statements written by her to be believed because they were *hers*. Yet she was and is the source; therefore, within Theosophical circles, her statements are trusted as authoritative. And for her to write definitely that another messenger would appear in the last quarter of the twentieth century was insurance against faithful Theosophists being deceived as to the occult status of any who might pose as "new revealers" before the cycle for further inquiry and deeper learning had arrived.

The Veil of Isis

In accumulating property for ourselves or our posterity, in founding a family or a state, or acquiring fame even, we are mortal; but in dealing with truth we are immortal, and need fear no change nor accident. The oldest Egyptian or Hindoo philosopher raised a corner of the veil from the statue of the divinity; and still the trembling robe remains raised, and I gaze upon as fresh a glory as he did, since it was I in him that was then so bold, and it is he in me that now reviews the vision. No dust has settled on that robe; no time has elapsed since that divinity was revealed. That time which we really improve, or which is improvable, is neither past, present, nor future.

—Henry David Thoreau.

AMONG YOUTH-COMPANIONS

I'VE been continuing correspondence with our friend, Lawrence, in New York," said Dave, when discussion on the *Ocean* was over. "In his last letter he suggested an idea for our discussion tonight that seems to me very good. Recently their group in New York spent a very productive evening concerning themselves with a fundamental philosophical question. It so happened that through communication with some of the younger students in another group, also, the same problem was used. Lawrence's idea, therefore, was to compare notes on the conclusions of each group. The question, being a central one, allows different types of development. I'll try to explain the question and if there are no objections we might work with it tonight, and afterwards you would probably all be interested to see how the same subject was handled elsewhere through the report in Lawrence's letter."

"That sounds like a very practical step in the natural sharing of ideas across the continent," commented Gail. "What is the problem?"

"The subject appears simple enough," replied Dave, "but just wait until you get into it. 'Is evil the result of ignorance?' Plato, whom we regard as one of our greatest Western Theosophists, contended, through Socrates, that it is. For instance, in the *Protagoras* Socrates says, 'No one willingly goes after evil or what he thinks to be evil. It isn't in human nature apparently to do so.' On the other hand, we are probably all familiar with H. P. B.'s statement in *The Secret Doctrine* that 'even the savage can discern white from black, good from bad. . . . ' "

"Don't we all know through our own experience that H. P. B. was right?" offered Alayne. "Everybody does things he knows are wrong at times, though if he is a Theosophist he hopes he will come to a time when he won't."

"I don't really think the two statements are in disagreement," said King, "but for the present I would like to defend Plato's argument. I think he would say that people who do something when they have a feeling they shouldn't, may feel that it is wrong, but not *enough* of a wrong to keep them from something else that seems momentarily more desirable."

"But how about the teaching that there are some who *deliberately choose* the 'left hand path' and become the enemies of all true Theosophists, because they reach adeptship in evil?" asked Janice.

"I think they would try to justify their choice logically by saying that they could get more for themselves in that way and that 'get-

ting for themselves' was the most intelligent thing they could think of—the 'Highest Good,' as Plato would put it," answered King.

"You're saying that selfishness is ignorance," commented Dave. "But aren't all those beings, who consciously take the left hand path, developed to a high degree of mentality, and haven't they had ample opportunity to learn what is right and what is wrong?"

"Of course they've had the *opportunity,* but that isn't the question. Did they learn it? Are you sure they know it *when* they act wrongly? It seems to me they must be ignorant of the most fundamental truth to be learned by anyone—that one can act wisely only when he acts 'for and as the Self of all creatures'."

"But take Solovyoff," offered Martinez, "who studied Theosophy for quite a long time and then wrote *A Modern Priestess of Isis* in denunciation of all that H. P. Blavatsky stood for. He couldn't have studied Theosophy and not known something about the interdependence of all life."

"But he couldn't really know it unless he had lived it," answered Gail. "If he had *lived* it he would have truly *known* it and then he would have acted differently."

"Plato's case sounds all right so far," admitted Dave, "but how about intuition and conscience? If intuition is direct perception and we have a true intuition that something is wrong and then go ahead and do it anyway, that would seem to be a flat contradiction. In other words, if we have had the intuitive warning, can we consider ourselves ignorant at the time we act?"

"We wouldn't really *act* at the time we felt the intuition clearly," returned King. "But we know how easily flashes of intuition can be allowed to fade into the background. It's the whole principle upon which knowledge can be forgotten, and we know that this happens to all of us. When we rationalize our selfish desires we are using a very effective way of aiding such forgetfulness. The man himself cannot *know* two contradictory things at the same time. But his higher nature and the lower animal nature give him contrasting ideas of what course of action to take. If he does not have firm and high resolve, the voice of the lower nature will be so convincing that he can easily decide he had a 'false intuition' and should disregard it."

"But how could the person have forgotten his intuition if he has pangs of conscience after his decision?" questioned Alayne.

"I can answer that one," said Gail. "A person can become involved in his desires so that the higher nature temporarily can't make itself heard, but afterwards, when the desire is to some degree

satisfied, the higher nature complains about the whole proceeding. In other words, it does seem logical to me that a person might *absolutely know* both before and after the decision that it was wrong, while at the time he could only see that it was 'good'—that is, good for the personality. And the personality would be the only thing he was concerned with at the moment."

"But what would H. P. B. mean when she said that even the savage knows good from bad?" put in Janice, evidently feeling that definite Theosophical teachings were being neglected.

"Well now, I'll ask a question in return," continued King. "Does that mean that every savage knows that it is wrong to take the life of another in tribal warfare? I think many primitive peoples were happy after battles in proportion to the number of enemies they had killed. But even a savage like that would feel unhappy if he killed his father in a fit of rage, wouldn't he?"

"Now you're getting into something different, Janice," said Dave. "I think what you say is true, but it would mean that the savage knows only that some particular things are wrong; he doesn't know 'right' *from* 'wrong' in every instance."

"And if Plato might be allowed another word here," added King, "I think he would say that the savage must educate himself through natural evolution to the point where he sees the moral issue in every experience, rather than just in a few limited situations."

"Seems to me, the problem doesn't need to be quite this complicated," said Gail thoughtfully. "Perhaps H. P. B.'s statement is simply an illustrative way of saying that any self-conscious man does have a moral sense—that is, he knows the difference between right and wrong instinctively or intuitively in some instances, although his mind may not yet have evolved to the point where he will see evil to *be* evil elsewhere."

"Well, I think this is the time to read Lawrence's brief statement of the conclusion reached in New York," said Dave. *"H. P. B.'s sentence implies that in every man there is a moral nature, while the emphasis of Socrates is upon the fact that moral perceptions must be educated through right philosophy."*

Everyone considered this for a moment. After nodding his head meditatively Max affirmed, "That's right; that is the way we have to look at human nature, as people who study Theosophy, if we hope to improve the world by spreading ideas."

"Yes," said Gail. "I think I can see why Lawrence thought this an important as well as an interesting subject. We believe that if we present a rational basis for ethics men will be led through right

ideas to a sense of responsibility and then to right action—and we think that the lives of real Theosophists prove this sort of education actually works."

"And underlying that hope," continued Dave, "is the Theosophical idea that man is primarily a moral being, connected with a body of natural desires arising from the intelligence in the lower instruments he uses. Those instruments are so insistent on announcing the desires they would like to have carried out that it is difficult for the moral being to understand that his purpose in evolution is not the purpose of the 'lower lives'—which purpose tends towards separateness. In man separateness becomes selfishness. Through philosophy he must learn to understand what the definitions of his own complex nature are, so that he can consciously choose his own course as a responsible moral agent. Eventually he can reach the stage achieved by the greatest Adepts—being constitutionally incapable of deviating from the right or selfless path."

"Yes," continued King, "that would seem to be the logical implication of the Socratic idea that men can *learn* to distinguish right from wrong in all the problems of life; and, having learned it, they are of necessity governed by their knowledge. Once they *know* the nature of the Good, through bringing their whole nature into harmony with the highest purpose, and living in the light of that purpose, then understanding is complete, and they 'never again fall into error'—never, at least, during this period of evolution."

"I guess the first and last form of real ignorance, then," concluded Alayne, "must be selfishness—the false belief that man can serve the purposes of self truly without serving the Universal Self of all beings."

Death of the Animal

We are conscious of an animal in us, which awakens in proportion as our higher nature slumbers. . . . Yet the spirit can for the time pervade and control every member and function of the body, and transmute what in form is the grossest sensuality into purity and devotion. . . . He is blessed who is assured that the animal is dying out in him day by day, and the divine being established.

—Henry David Thoreau.

IMAGINATION AND OCCULT PHENOMENA

THE faculty of imagination has been reduced to a very low level by modern western theorisers upon mental philosophy. It is "only the making of pictures, day-dreaming, fancy, and the like": thus they have said about one of the noblest faculties in man. In Occultism it is well known to be of the highest importance that one should have the imagination under such control as to be able to make a picture of anything at any time, and if this power has not been so trained the possession of other sorts of knowledge will not enable one to perform certain classes of occult phenomena.

Those who have read Mr. Sinnett's *Occult World* will have noticed two or three classes of phenomena performed by H. P. Blavatsky and her unseen friends, and those who have investigated spiritualism will know that in the latter have been many cases of similar phenomena done by so-called "controls." Others who made no such investigations have, however, on their own account seen many things done by forces not mechanical but of a nature which must be called occult or psychical. In spiritualism, and by the Adepts like H. P. Blavatsky and others, one thing has excited great interest, that is the precipitating on to paper or other substances of messages out of the air, as it were, and without any visible contact between the sender of the message and the precipitated letters themselves. This has often occurred in *séances* with certain good mediums, and the late Stainton Moses wrote in a letter which I saw many years ago that there had come under his hand certain messages precipitated out of the air. But in these cases the medium never knows what is to be precipitated, cannot control it at will, is in fact wholly ignorant of the whole matter and the forces operating and how they operate. The elemental forces make the pictures through which the messages are precipitated, and as the inner nature of the medium is abnormally developed, acting subconsciously to the outer man, the whole process is involved in darkness so far as spiritualism is concerned. But not so with trained minds or wills such as possessed by Madame Blavatsky and all like her in the history of the past, including the still living Adepts.

The Adepts who consciously send messages from a distance or who impress thoughts or sentences on the mind of another at a distance are able to do so because their imagination has been fully trained.

NOTE.—This article by William Q. Judge was printed in the *Path* for December, 1892.

The wonderworker of the East who makes you see a snake where there is none, or who causes you to see a number of things done in your presence which were not done in fact, is able to so impress you with his trained imagination, which, indeed, is also often in his case an inheritance, and when inherited it is all the stronger when trained and the easier to put into training. In the same way but to a much smaller degree the modern western hypnotizer influences his subject by the picture he makes with his imagination in those cases where he causes the patient to see or not to see at will, and if that power were stronger in the West than it is, the experiments of the hypnotizing schools would be more wonderful than they are.

Take the case of precipitation. In the first place, all the minerals, metals, and colored substances any one could wish for use are in the air about us held in suspension. This has long been proved so as to need no argument now. If there be any chemical process known that will act on these substances, they can be taken from the air and thrown down before us into visibility. This visibility only results from the closer packing together of the atoms of matter composing the mass. Modern science has only a few processes for thus precipitating, but while they do not go to the length of precipitating in letters or figures they do show that such precipitation is possible. Occultism has a knowledge of the secret chemistry of nature whereby those carbons and other substances in the air may be drawn out at will either separately or mixed. The next step is to find for these substances so to be packed together a mold or matrix through which they may be poured, as it were, and, being thus closely packed, become visible. Is there such a mold or matrix?

The matrix is made by means of the trained imagination. It must have been trained either now or in some other life before this, or no picture can be precipitated nor message impressed on the brain to which it is directed. The imagination makes a picture of each word of each letter of every line and part of line in every letter and word, and having made that picture it is held there by the will and the imagination acting together for such a length of time as is needed to permit the carbons or other substances to be strained down through this matrix and appear upon the paper. This is exactly the way in which the Masters of H. P. B. sent those messages which they did not write with their hands, for while they precipitated some they wrote some others and sent them by way of the ordinary mail.

The explanation is the same for the sending of a message by words which the receiver is to hear. The image of the person who is to be the recipient has to be made and held in place; that is, in each

of the cases you have to become as it were a magic lantern or a camera obscura, and if the image of the letters or if the image of the person be let go or blurred, all the other forces will shoot wide of the mark and naught be accomplished. If a picture were made of the ineffectual thoughts of the generality of people, it would show little lines of force flying out from their brains and instead of reaching their destination falling to the earth just a few feet away from the person who is thus throwing them out.

But, of course, in the case of sending and precipitating on to paper a message from a distance, a good many other matters have to be well known to the operator. For instance, the inner as well as the outer resistance of all substances have to be known, for if not calculated they will throw the aim out, just as the billiard ball may be deflected if the resistance of the cushion is variable and not known to be so by the player. And again, if a living human being has to be used as the other battery at this end of the line, all the resistances and also all the play of that person's thought have to be known or a complete failure may result. This will show those who inquire about phenomena, or who at a jump wish to be adepts or to do as the adepts can do, what a task it is they would undertake. But there is still another consideration, and that is that inasmuch as all these phenomena have to do with the very subtle and powerful planes of matter it must follow that each time a phenomenon is done the forces of those planes are roused to action, and reaction will be equal to action in these things just as on the ordinary plane.

An illustration will go to make clear what has been said of the imagination. One day H. P. Blavatsky said she would show me precipitation in the very act. She looked fixedly at a certain smooth piece of wood and slowly on it came out letters which at last made a long sentence. It formed before my eyes and I could see the matter condense and pack itself on the surface. All the letters were like such as she would make with her hand, just because she was making the image in her brain and of course followed her own peculiarities. But in the middle, one of the letters was blurred and, as it were, all split into a mass of mere color as to part of the letter.

"Now here," she said, "I purposely wandered in the image, so that you could see the effect. As I let my attention go, the falling substance had no matrix and naturally fell on the wood any way and without shape."

A friend on whom I could rely told me that he once asked a wonderworker in the East what he did when he made a snake come and go before the audience, and he replied that he had been taught

from very early youth to see a snake before him and that it was so strong an image everyone there had to see it.

"But," said my friend, "how do you tell it from a real snake?"

The man replied that he was able to see through it, so that for him it looked like the shadow of a snake, but that if he had not done it so often he might be frightened by it himself. The process he would not give, as he claimed it was a secret in his family. But anyone who has made the trial knows that it is possible to train the imagination so as to at will bring up before the mind the outlines of any object whatsoever, and that after a time the mind seems to construct the image as if it were a tangible thing.

But there is a wide difference between this and the kind of imagination which is solely connected with some desire or fancy. In the latter case the desire and the image and the mind with all its powers are mixed together, and the result, instead of being a training of the image-making power, is to bring on a decay of that power and only a continual flying to the image of the thing desired. This is the sort of use of the power of the imagination which has lowered it in the eyes of the modern scholar, but even that result would not have come about if the scholars had a knowledge of the real inner nature of man.

WILLIAM Q. JUDGE.

"PRINCIPLES" OF FIRE

As man is composed of Spirit, Soul, and Body, *plus* a fourfold aspect; so is Fire. As in the works of Robert Flood (de Fluctibus), one of the famous Rosicrucians, fire contains—Firstly, a visible flame (body); secondly, an invisible, astral fire (soul); and thirdly, spirit. The four aspects are (*a*) heat (life), (*b*) light (mind), (*c*) electricity (Kamic or molecular powers), and (*d*) the synthetic essences, *beyond spirit,* or the radical cause of its existence and manifestation. For the Hermetist or Rosicrucian, when a flame is extinct on the objective plane, it has only passed from the seen world into the unseen; from the knowable into the unknowable.

—H. P. BLAVATSKY.

THE KARMA OF ANIMALS

THE error often committed, is to mistake the general law of cause and effect for the law of merit and demerit. If we ask, why has one animal an easy life to lead and another a hard one, we might ask also, why is one tree cut down before it is grown up, while another tree is allowed to die of old age? Why is one pair of shoes made to adorn the feet of a lady in a ballroom, and another pair to be dragged through the mud by a boor? No one will maintain that minerals and plants have any moral responsibility. Neither have animals, children, idiots or the insane any such moral responsibility. This is a fact recognized by human legislation, and it was reserved for the ignorance of the 14th century to judicially try and punish animals according to a Jewish law, laid down in Exodus xxi. 28, which says: "If an ox gore a man or a woman that they die, then the ox shall be surely stoned, and his flesh shall not be eaten, but the owner of the ox shall be quit." According to that law in 1386 the judge of Falaise condemned a sow to be mutilated in the leg and head, and afterwards to be hung, for having torn the face and arm of a child and then killing it. This was a Draconian infliction of punishment. This sow was executed in the public square, clothed in a man's dress.

The law of Karma is a moral law, and where no moral responsibility exists, there can be no application of the law of Karma; but the law of cause and effect applies to all departments of nature.

A celebrated writer says: "Suffering is heaven's divine medicine." The law of *compensation* is also active in the animal world. A dog that has to exercise its own sagacity to find food, will sooner develop psychical powers in that direction than one that does nothing but eat and sleep, and the individual or differentiated monad of the former will sooner reach the condition necessary to enter the human kingdom. The rudiments of hope, patience, faith, fidelity, confidence, etc., are found ni the animal kingdom. By putting them into exercise, they will become stronger, and as no effort in nature is ever lost, they will find their uses. If we understand the laws of the universe, we shall have no occasion to find fault with them, and become convinced of the uselessness to attempt to improve or correct Supreme Wisdom, or "God."

—*The Theosophist,* June, 1884, p. 223.

ON THE LOOKOUT

Motives Will Make "The Peace"

It is heartening to the theosophist to see so many thoughtful Americans giving as much deliberation to the kind of peace that will follow the present war as to the actual business of winning it. Indeed, some are so outspoken as to assert that if a just peace is not achieved, we might as well lose out in the military struggle, for the result of a bad peace would be more wars in the future. That these issues are being prominently discussed is the most hopeful sign on the present horizon, for however men may differ as to the wisest and most equitable course, the fact that they are considered at all indicates that an examination of *motive* is going on, self-consciously and self-critically. Only as Americans and all the contestants in this great struggle clarify their own motives can there emerge from the war the clear perceptions that will be needed to make right choices for the world of tomorrow.

The Real Enemy

A few days after the United States became involved, the eminent historian, Prof. James T. Shotwell, of Columbia University, in a radio address entitled, "After the War," made the following pertinent observations to his countrymen:

> The final victory will not be won until the menace of militarism is overthrown. This and nothing short of it is the war aim of the free peoples, for it is the condition of their freedom. It is also the only way we can preserve the American way of life. For however troubled has been its history in the past, it is fundamentally a thing of peace. It can never wholly prosper, never be wholly secure so long as it has to face a constant or recurring danger of attack by nations that use war as the instrument of their policy. (*Bulletin* 376, Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.)

Tragic "Necessity"

The tragic paradox confronting honest liberals like Dr. Shotwell is the problem of defeating militarism without becoming essentially militaristic; of using a means detested by all humanitarians to achieve an end which is the very antithesis of those means. The unspeakably bitter necessity of turning the pacific land of America into an armed camp for the purpose of preserving the elements of a free life and a peaceful order for future generations—for this is the way in which

all but a handful of pacifists formulate the problem—is arousing the conscience of American liberals, and they are demanding that "this time" there be no waste of the incalculable sacrifices that war always brings. Dr. Shotwell continues:

> In the last war, the vision and purpose of the American people was clearly expressed at the beginning but was lost sight of later on. There was nothing false in 1917 about the slogan "to make the world safe for democracy" or about "a war to end war." It was only later that the luster of those phrases was dimmed and tarnished by our failure to carry on after the war was over.

A Chief "War Aim"

After some discussion of why the last peace was "a mere armistice between wars," he turns to the problems of the next peace. Most difficult, he thinks, will be "the restoration of freedom not only to those who have been conquered but to those who have surrendered their liberty to tyrants at home."

> The rebuilding of the international order calls for the reëducation of those who have been misled in youth and the reëstablishment of the standards of human dignity, equality, and tolerance throughout the world. Our Bill of Rights should be made the basis of an International Bill of Rights safeguarding not only personal liberty but freedom of thought, of religion, and of expression. Nowhere in the world should there be left a Gestapo, that symbol of arbitrary imprisonment and torture. But the reëstablishment of the realm of law within the moral order has to take into account the way in which nations have been governed in the past. No uniform system of rights can be imposed equally upon nations with long experience in self-government and those who never had it. Here then is one of our chief war aims which must be clarified by the work of jurists and historians, so that in the peace settlement it will not prove a source of disillusionment.

Some Pointed Questions

Here, indeed, is a problem of enormous complexity. The difficulties that are involved, as well as the confusion in American thinking on the subject, are made clear by a recent *Christian Century* editorial:

> Sir Stafford Cripps has just returned from Moscow calling for an immediate, specific definition of European war aims. Every thoughtful student of the war must recognize that there is even more need for a statement of war aims in the Pacific than in Europe. It is conceivable that at the end of the war Europe might slip back into a fairly familiar pattern. But that cannot be in Asia; there

major changes are certain. If the war ends with utter defeat of Japan, what is to be the fate of the French colonies, now a Japanese pawn? Or of the Japanese colonies? But beyond such issues, what of Hongkong, what of our special rights in China, what of the aspirations for freedom in the Philippines, in Burma, in the Dutch colonies? Most of all, what of India? The people of Asia want to know: In the event of our victory, is the old colonial system to be revived and perpetuated? Or is there to be a new colonial system, with the United States inheriting the dominance hitherto exercised by Britain?

An "American Century"?

We can hardly blame Asiatics for asking these questions. For months before the outbreak of the war it was being said in many American periodicals that the promise to give complete freedom to the Philippines in 1946 would never be carried into effect. Mr. Luce, who speaks with the backing of a veritable magazine empire, has heralded the dawn of an "American century" in which our economic control of Asia will "be worth to us four, five, ten billions of dollars a year." Mr. Willkie, orating from a Joe Louis fight ring the other night, with a large part of the world listening in, cried that "American democracy will rule the world." (Words the more revealing because they were apparently unpremeditated.) President Roosevelt, it should be said to his credit, has been careful to omit the Philippines from all his prophecies of the spots in the western Pacific over which the American flag will wave in the future. But this is only a negative assurance to one small segment of the Asiatic millions, and is perceptible only to those who make a careful analysis of the president's speeches. (*Christian Century,* Feb. 18, 1942.)

The "Heritage" We Fight For?

The complexity of these questions is itself a good reason why few publicists feel able to propose in any significant detail the solutions that may be applied. Nevertheless, every earnest American should be thinking about them and assembling in his own mind the principles that have application to the issues. The solution offered by an educator recently, in the pages of *School and Society* (Dec. 6, 1941), illustrates one line of opinion that should be carefully examined for its ethical implications. Thomas C. Barham, Jr., has the following to say:

We are, however, undertaking much more than the destruction of the Nazi systems. We have a positive duty toward the preservation and continuance of our system of economic imperialism (to safeguard vital raw products), including finance, capitalism, private enterprise, quest for markets and control over exchange facilities. And superimposed upon these factors comes the pledge to preserve

our cultural ideals and institutions: democracy, social security, equality before the bar of justice, freedom of religion, universal education and the many other rights, usages and privileges so precious to our way of life. We have a continuous obligation to save this heritage against the world, if the need arises.

"Struggle For Existence"

What is the responsibility of the educational forces in America toward this program? How can educators effectively contribute toward the achievement of these ends? First of all, these good men and women must divest themselves of their illusions about this world. The stark realities of the struggle for existence among human societies must be acknowledged. The doctrines of peace as we have understood them during the past twenty years must be recognized as proceeding from false premises; they must never be revived—never, that is, until the primary causes of war have been permanently removed.

Our nation is embarked on a course of world leadership which can be established only through conquest and maintained by force, or its equivalent, the constant threat of force. Educational leaders in the United States will have a very important responsibility upon their shoulders. They must develop and keep alive a spirited and militant democratic tradition devoted to maintaining a world that will be amenable to the evolution of our cultural, economic and political concepts. Only by being ready spiritually and materially to crush promptly every incipient threat against the orderly development of economic and social life, can the frightfulness of widespread war be avoided. We cannot afford to repeat the folly of the past twenty years and permit our hatred of war to trick us again out of peace.

Another Program

This writer (whose article is titled "Peace—the Great Delusion") frankly asserts that American "ideals" can proceed in their development only through conquest and by maintaining the "constant threat of force" against all opposition. He advocates "the preservation and continuance of our system of economic imperialism." Contrasted with this type of "war aim" is Dr. Shotwell's contention, who urges that while as victors England and America must,

> on the one hand, use their military and economic power to restore and maintain order in the world; they must, on the other hand, make it clear beyond all doubt that in so doing they seek for themselves no special material or political advantage. Other nations who have joined in and made sacrifices for the cause of freedom cannot be

> ignored. Latin-American nations must not be excluded. Harder still, the fundamental interests of Germany, Italy, and Japan have also to be kept in mind. There must be no imperialism under the Anglo-Saxon system any more than under the German. These pitfalls, however, are more theoretic than real. No one wants to repeat the situation which after 1919 led the European nations into such desperate nationalistic competition. Permanent peace lies in following the methods of democracy which are those of cooperation and understanding, and of equal justice to all.

Let us hope that Mr. Shotwell is right in believing that "no one" wants to repeat the disastrous course that followed the last war. It may be true that no one wants disaster, but Mr. Barham's article is evidence enough that there are those who want things that every conscientious historian knows have *caused* disaster in the past.

Pacifist "Folly"

Mr. Barham's view that "The stark realities of the struggle for existence among human societies must be acknowledged," and that the attempt to introduce other methods than war for the solving of international problems was a "folly of the past twenty years" is typical of the thinking of a number of American leaders. This was the theme of Archibald Macleish's attack on post-war Pacifism; the same contentions were nakedly expressed thirty years ago by Homer Lea in his *Day of the Saxon* and *The Valor of Ignorance.* Hitler, in *Mein Kampf,* agrees. He charged the pacifists with weakening German character both before and after the first World War, and the various peace societies in Germany were suppressed when the Nazi Party came to power. Jews, particularly, were accused of spreading pernicious pacifist doctrines. In fact, "semitic" and "pacifistic" are the adjectives Hitler finds most useful in conveying his supreme contempt! An article in *Colliers* (Nov. 8, 1941) described the recent execution of three Dutch pacifists, as men whose philosophy was recognized by the invaders as being the most dangerous to the Nazi "way of life."

Spirit of the Time

The extraordinary contradiction of thought and action in the present historical epoch is pointedly discussed in the January *Atlantic* by Raoul de Roussy de Sales. Writing on "The Opposition to War," he begins:

> What may turn out to be the most important and characteristic trait of the times we live in is the existence of a universal and deeply rooted opposition to war. This sentiment is so general and so new in some of its manifestations that it will take the perspective of his-

tory to analyze it fully and to appraise correctly its influence on the state of mind and on the behavior of the millions of men and women who are involved directly or indirectly in this war.

Mr. de Sales develops the thesis that the most civilized of nations are those least inclined to resort to war. The man of the twentieth century, he says,

> does not need any further demonstration that war is not only inhuman and evil, but also senseless and futile. And yet we live in a time when this lesson has to be unlearned, when we have to rehabilitate within our own selves instincts which our reason has condemned as barbaric, or create new reasons and new impulses to justify our plunging into what we want to avoid. . . . In fact the whole conflict in which we are engaged revolves around this question: Is it possible for the Western civilized world to stop the barbaric assault launched upon it by Germany without itself reverting to a state of barbarism?

A Clear Formulation

Or, to put the question in a more concrete form, can we demonstrate to the average man on our side of the fence:—

1. That, although everything he knows and feels about the evilness of war is true, he must nevertheless make war now?
2. That he must therefore either forget temporarily everything he has been told about the senselessness and uselessness of war, or find new reasons for having recourse to war?
3. That if he cannot do these things he must nevertheless agree to sacrifice many of the spiritual and material achievements of civilization on the mystic premise that the sacrifice in itself will ensure, somehow or other, the salvation of this civilization?

If the problem presented in this fashion approximates the reality of the situation, I believe one can say it has not been solved as yet.

Progress or Decadence?

Mr. de Sales' examination of the implications of these questions is intensely interesting and should be read in full in the *Atlantic*. He points out that the nations which are less "civilized" (from the western viewpoint) are those that have shown the best military morale and unity in the present struggle. It may be, he suggests,

> that the Russians, like the Poles, the Finns, the Greeks, and other less highly "civilized" people, have retained towards war an attitude which I would call more "normal" than the western Europeans and the Americans. This does not mean that they enjoy war, but merely that they are less confused than the Western people when the brutal choice between war and destruction is presented to them.

No such unity of purpose, no such acceptance of total sacrifice, no such morale existed among people whose civilization was more complex, who had grown to depend more upon the intricate mechanism of Western industrialism, and whose political life also had, during the last twenty years of the post-war period, been more directly subject to the dissolving forces of Western anti-war education.

Without minimizing the heroism and suffering of hundreds of thousands of men and women of the Western democracies, there is no doubt that the Scandinavians, the Dutch, the Belgians, and the French did not enter this war or fight it with the same disregard of individual sacrifice and of future consequences as did the less complex people of Poland, Finland, Greece or Russia. . . . Given the mentality of the Western people, their ideas of war, and the education they had received during the twenty years that separated World War I and World War II, there was no possibility for them to accomplish over night the fundamental transformation from pacifism to full war-mindedness that was necessary to meet the crisis. Still clinging to peace, they slipped into war. They behaved like a man who has fallen in the water and who struggles desperately to reach the shore, but whose frantic efforts will not prevent him from drowning if he does not know how to swim.

"Confusion, Disunity, Uneasiness, Blindness"

The great question, of course, is whether the western nations erred in educating their people for peace instead of for war, or in failing to establish a pattern of international relations that would destroy the underlying causes of war. Now that the world is engulfed in a conflict that makes World War I take on the aspect of a preliminary "skirmish," men of the West had better make it their business to discover once and for all the factors that are essential to the construction of a peaceful order of society. "Something," Mr. de Sales observes, must be found to replace the confusion, the disunity, the uneasiness and blindness which have characterized European and American civilization since 1918. These conditions are the inheritance of the West. And, he adds,

> until we succeed in repudiating this inheritance, and in replacing it by something that will protect us against confusion, division of counsel, and chronic lethargy, there is little chance that Hitler will be stopped except by the exhaustion of his own momentum.
>
> What this "something" will be, I do not know. It may eventually spring out of this very anti-war force, out of this unwillingness of men to fight other men which seems so universal and so little affected by the evolution of the war itself. This Second World War may be

only a sort of relapse, and it may be that when it is ended the reconstruction of the peace that started in 1918 will be taken up again and carried on more successfully.

This may be so. But in the meanwhile the world is facing one of the greatest attempts at universal disintegration ever undertaken. It is at war, and the question is whether this war will be won in spite of the reluctance of Western peoples to overcome the long spell of anti-war sentiment which for twenty years has been their main conviction, and to which even today they still cling.

"One Natid in the Enfiden"

There are those placid souls who maintain that Dr. R. M. Hutchins of the University of Chicago is an alarmist, that nothing much is wrong with education in the United States, and that all we have to do is go ahead the way we have been, doing "the best we can," and "everything will be all right." Before considering Dr. Hutchins' latest utterances in criticism of modern education, the results of an experiment carried out by a junior high school teacher of San Francisco may be reported. This teacher wondered how many of his pupils *understood* the Pledge to the Flag and determined to find out. According to the *New Age* for February:

He asked his students to write the Pledge, along with the first verses of the "Star Spangled Banner" and "America." Here is a sample of the work turned out by a ninth grade pupil, supposedly of at least average ability, as reported by the teacher, Wilbur W. Raisner, writing in *Sierra Educational News.*

> I plege a legon to the flag of the undidited states of America one natid in the enfiden for which it stands.

Here is another:

> I plegd you leagent to the flag of the United States of America one nation indidual for which it stand.

To cut the story short, only 12 out of 344 papers turned in were correct in both wording and spelling. About a third of them were incorrectly worded, many on a par with the above examples. It was very clear that, as a whole, the students did not have the remotest idea of what the Pledge to the flag meant. Apparently they had just been mumbling words, meaningless words.

Menace of Slogans

Turning to Dr. Hutchins, we find him saying in *Harper's* for last October:

The ability to read and write is the best defense against anti-democractic propaganda. The reiteration of slogans—now advo-

cated by many American educators under the name of "indoctrination for democracy"—is not much better than the reiteration of lies as practiced by the Nazis. When a person equipped with the liberal arts has critically studied the tradition of the Western World and faced the basic theoretical questions, he is proof against the seductions of the New Order. The reason why we may justly fear foreign propaganda today is that we are uneducated.

Dr. Hutchins quotes from the *Wall Street Journal* the following expression of Thomas F. Woodlock on the importance and meaning of a "liberal" education:

> Democracy rests ultimately upon "public opinion" as its base. Public opinion follows upon free speech, free interchange of *ideas,* of *judgments,* of *opinions;* it is generated by these things. Men interchange these things by *words.* . . . Sound logic it was that put grammar, logic, and rhetoric as preliminary to geometry, arithmetic, music, and astronomy in the scheme of the seven liberal arts in an age which was notable for its clearness of thinking and the exactitude of its expression. Both these things are absolutely necessary to the functioning of democracy as the best form of government. If we are going to "educate for democracy," we had better find the right way to teach them.

Learned Illiteracy

One need not subscribe to the view that the thirteenth was the "greatest of centuries" in order to appreciate the force of this argument. Authoritarian regimes may rule by slogans, but democracies must rule by *meanings,* and there can be no democracy unless the members of the community are able to understand the words by which meanings are conveyed. This involves, first and foremost, the ability to read and write. But, as Dr. Hutchins says,

> It is common knowledge that our professional students and candidates for the Ph.D. are illiterate. One thing you learn very quickly in teaching students at the loftiest levels of education is that they cannot read; and President Conant of Harvard in his report for 1938-39 said, "From all sides, academic and non-academic, we hear complaints of the inability of the average Harvard undergraduate to write either correctly or fluently." Frederick E. Crane, when Chief Judge of the highest court of New York, plaintively remarked to the alumni of the Columbia Law School, "I do wish that the Law School had an effectual way of doing that which the previous college experience has failed to do for so many students—teach them to speak the English language clearly." And he added, "I should say that not one lawyer out of fifty can state clearly the facts of his case and his legal position concerning them."

EDUCATING FOR DEMOCRACY

So Dr. Hutchins is not an alarmist. He is simply telling the people of the United States the unpleasant truth—the truth that is necessary for them to know if the ideals and liberties they cherish in name are to be preserved in fact. He concludes:

> If we cannot give a liberal education to every citizen in proportion to his capacity to receive it we might as well give up our hopes of achieving a democratic community. We cannot insist on free men and at the same time say that we cannot educate our population for freedom. We cannot insist on a community and at the same time say that it is impossible to lay the basis of communication among our people. . . . If we cannot give them all this education we may as well drop the pretense of democracy. We may as well admit that, though it was a good idea, it would not work.

Persons who have thought that Dr. Hutchins is interested only in the "higher" learning for an intellectual elite should make it their business to read this *Harper's* article in full. Actually, his primary concern is to help make American self-government *work,* and he knows that this means "minds committed to the good by good moral and intellectual habits"; that it means "minds informed by principles derived from human experience through the ages, minds that will operate well no matter what waves of change beat upon them."

KARMA OF ACCIDENTS

"Accidents" form a vast field of study for one who would begin to understand the mysteries of Karma. In the curious recurrence of accidents of a certain type, in connection with particular places or individuals, the student may see evidence of the law of the cyclic return of impressions, working in a manner that those ignorant of occult law find peculiarly puzzling. For example, a man charged with the responsibility of reducing traffic accidents in a great western city, found that again and again, after a fatality had occurred in one place along the highway or city street, other serious accidents often followed in the same place. Inasmuch as the first accident could not be attributed to anything especially dangerous about its location, the later ones became increasingly difficult to explain. Experience of this sort has discouraged the plan of marking with a cross or other warning symbol the places where deaths from accident have occurred. Repetition of accidents to the same person was the subject of a "Studies in Karma" article printed in this Magazine (XXV, 540), and with this phase of the problem it would be interesting to correlate the strange Karma of twins discussed in Lookout for October,

1940 (XXVIII, 570-73.) The value of close attention to phenomena of this sort lies in their general recognition by non-Theosophists whose work or other interest has brought home to them the reality of such happenings. Insurance companies, for example, according to the February, 1940, number of *Unknown,* are well aware that some persons must be regarded as "accident prone." A paragraph signed by L. Ron Hubbard reads:

> While such firms cannot release actual names and thus blacklist men, they can confirm the facts contained here and even enlarge upon the size of the accident prone legion which is everywhere about us. Attention is further drawn to the maritime "superstition" about "Jonahs." One such man has survived unscathed, every major naval disaster in the past twenty years. He is frankly called Jonah as a nickname and will not now be allowed aboard any ship. Note, too, that certain crews repeatedly lose their ships to U-boats. Not until recently was it completely proved, beyond all shadow of doubt, that the elimination of certain men from industrial plants met with a decrease if not a cessation of accidents in that plant.

"Men Karmic Agents"

An article printed in the *Path* by Mr. Judge deals with such happenings from the viewpoint of karmic influence. A "Karmic Agent" is defined as—

> one who concentrates more rapidly than is usual the lines of influence that bring about events sometimes in a strange and subtle way. Of these there are two classes; the first those among the mass who, from the lives they have led in the past, arrive in this one gifted—or cursed—with the power unknown to themselves. The second, those who by training have the power, or rather have become concentrators of the forces, and know it to be the case. Of these are the Adepts, both great and small. . . .
>
> It is a well-known tradition in India, called by the civilized West a superstition, that if one should meet and talk with an Adept his Karma good and bad would come to a head more quickly than usual, and thus that the Adept could confer a boon, letting the evil pass and increasing the good (Theosophy II, 265-6).

Accelerated Effects

This latter belief is doubtless the origin of the Christian custom of asking blessings of holy men. The writer of the above article quotes H. P. B. to the effect that

> there are many people in the world, engaged in its affairs, who are, without knowing it, Karmic agents in this special sense, and continually bring to others good and bad sudden effects which otherwise

would have come slowly to pass, spread over many more days or years, and showing in a number of small events instead of in one.

If this theory be true, we have here also the explanation of the evil eye, which is only a corrupt form of the knowledge that there are such Karmic agents among us who by looking at others draw together very quickly effects that without the presence of the Karmic agent might never have been noticed because of their taking more time to transpire.

In contrast with the faculty of precipitating tragedy is the quality of beneficence borne by those who "people their currents in space with entities powerful for good alone." Then there are those whose karmic stamina places them in a class exactly opposite to the "accident-prone." As H. P. B. remarks in *Isis Unveiled*:

The well-known story of the Indian chief, who confessed to Washington that at Braddock's defeat he had fired his rifle at him seventeen times at short range without being able to touch him, will recur to the reader in this connection. In fact, many great commanders have been believed by their soldiers to bear what is called "a charmed life." . . . (I, 379).

Other correlations will suggest themselves.

"AMATEUR" PHILOSOPHERS

A curious sidelight on what may be called human personality and character traits is provided in a review in *Philosophy of Science* for July, 1939. The book under consideration is *"Truth" as Conceived by those who Are not Professional Philosophers,* by Arne Ness, published in Oslo. The review, which is brief, we reproduce entire:

This may be described as a psychological study. The author has invoked the paraphernalia of questionnaires and statistical analyses. Amateurs, such as young school boys and girls, gave practically the same spectrum of replies as professional philosophers, the differences being those of degree. "Opinions on philosophical and metaphysical subjects (e.g. truth theories) can be conceived as retained pubertic formulations remodelled and deepened under the influence of formulations transmitted by tradition." High-hat philosophers have a bad time in this sparkling book.

In short, "philosophers" of the type here referred to have by formal education merely polished the attitudes that were deep-seated in their character before taking up the study of philosophy, and so with most of those who endeavor to express in words their basic convictions. These attitudes are established when adolescence is reached. How were they shaped? Only believers in reincarnation have an adequate answer to this question.